

WINKING



WORLD

The Official Journal of the
English Tiddlywinks Association

October 1991

Contents

Editorial.....	1
A farewell rant from the outgoing Editor	
The Cambridge Open	Stu Collins 3
Special better-late-than-never report	
The National Pairs	Jon Mapley 7
Dave nearly wins – bad luck	
The NATwA Singles	Larry Kahn 9
Dave nearly wins – bad luck	
The Catford Invitation	Gavin Keyte 11
Only the pigeons don't enjoy their day	
What have Stew Sage and Alan Dean got in common?	12
Apart from too many vowels to make any good anagrams...	
Letters to the Editor	13
A Practice to Stop Slow Play?	Andy Purvis 15
Another farewell rant from the outgoing editor	
Auntie Gertie's Problem Corner	16
She's back! (let out early for good behaviour)	
The London Open	Patrick Barrie 17
How to break your synchrotron	
Pot-Squop	Andy Purvis 20
If Wimbledon F.C. played tiddlywinks...	
Personal Column	April Date 23
Cambridge	Rob Cartwright 24
What does the word 'copyright' mean?	
How To Avoid Arrest Whilst Trying To Win The Singles Just Once More	Jon Mapley 24
Jon's side of the story	
Nostalgia isn't what it used to be... ..	Rob Cartwright 25
The Wessex Trophy	Andy Purvis 26
I must not amigos pints of fromps. I must not amigos pints of fromps. I must not...	
Nowink's Impottible: A Review	Charles Relle 27
More handy tips on fancy potting	

Editorial

A rather smaller Winking World this time around, largely because the last one was a tad late. Thanks to everyone who contributed. One piece that didn't get in was a list of anagrams from Ale Can Yob: but you might like to think about the identities of Licking Sin, Icky Man, Rest Me Jiffy, Lab Chemist? Never!, All-Chalet Sex, and Slow-Run Tripe. Tim Jeffreys gave me a wonderful cartoon of the OUTS summer punt trip (it only needed a small

ambulance to pick up the pieces); that would have adorned the back cover, but I seem to have lost it. If it is on the back cover, it's obviously reappeared at the last minute. Thanks also to Jon Mapley, who sent me a photocopy of WW26 to complete the set in the archive. This will be my last Winking World; there's some other silly document I'm supposed to write this year...

So the new season is underway. I hear that CUTwC recruitment has been okay if nothing special; OUTS numbers are down on last year but not desperately so (from the Fair: "A friend of mine knows a maths Don at Cambridge who does that... long red beard... likes jumping in the river..."). Last I heard, there was no recruitment expected at Sotwink. There may be a new club at St. Andrew's: Ben Soares, ex-OUTS, is starting a course there and intends to form a club. Looking further ahead, congratulations to Linda and Ian Gameson on their new recruit, Jonathan David, born on 17th October. With names like those, watch out for him at the Singles... Patrick Barrie, now at UCL, has found an excellent, though heavily-booked, room for winks there. The first gathering attracted a dozen players from around London, including Tim Hedger and Steve Harbron. It will obviously be great news if the meetings there can become regular events. The summer has seen the usual couple of invitation tournaments in Cambridge and also one in Oxford featuring a warped bidding system and resulted in the first $10\frac{2}{3}^*-0^*$ scoreline on record. There has been greater than usual activity in the U.S. this summer too: a NATwA 25th birthday reunion in Gill (wherever that is) attracted 34 winkers and families. Rick Tucker tells me it was hugely enjoyable, and sends this message to IFTwA: "Winks is indeed alive and well west of your border". Forthcoming U.S. events are an Individual Pairs tournament on 26th October and the NATwA Pairs the following weekend, featuring a return to the Pairs for a couple of winkers not seen much at tournaments recently: Sunshine and Indian. So the signs are good that the decrease in tournament attendances over there has been halted, although it isn't yet obvious where new players are going to come from. If you would like to be on Rick's electronic mailing list, he's cbs%uk.ac.nsfnet-relay::org.mitre.starbase::rwtucker

Stew and I have both been contacted by a Rebecca Woodgate, of Lincoln College, Oxford, who is trying to track down the rules of "Two-Handed Tiddlywinks" or, 'more precisely, how it differs from the normal rules of the game.' (This request was made 'for a friend'). Any offers?

The answer to the Winkonundrum in the last issue was sent in by Alan Boyce, who wins absolutely nothing for his trouble (which I hope gets better soon). The scores (Cowford first): Round 1: Alan Barrie & Ian Norman 3-4 Bob Cartwright & Keith Jeffreys, Heather Gandy & Ferd Inglis $3\frac{1}{2}$ - $3\frac{1}{2}$ Charles Outhwaite & Jim Kahn, Mike Ferguson & Nick Hancock 1-6 Ed Myers & Owen Andrew, Liz Dean and Patrick Edwards 1-6 Duncan Purvis & Geoff Lockwood. Round 2: Alan & Ian 7-0 Duncan & Geoff, Heather & Ferd 2-5 Ed & Owen, Mike & Nick 3-4 Charles & Jim, Liz & Patrick 1-6 Bob & Keith. Round 3: Alan & Ian 6-1 Ed & Owen, Heather & Ferd $5\frac{1}{2}$ - $1\frac{1}{2}$ Duncan & Geoff, Mike & Nick 6-1 Bob & Keith, Liz & Patrick 1-6 Charles & Jim. Round 4: Alan & Ian 2-4 Charles & Jim, Heather & Ferd 7-0 Bob & Keith, Mike & Nick 2-5 Duncan & Geoff, Liz & Patrick 6-1 Ed & Owen. Got all that? Good. Have fun.

The Cambridge Open

The Bowett Room, Queens' College, Cambridge. 9th & 10th February
by Stu Collins

Heavy snow seemed for a while to threaten the turnout for this year's Cambridge Open but, in the end, there were 31 entrants though a few notable absentees. Among the likely contenders were last year's co-winner and highest Briton in the Singles, Nick Inglis and ex-World Champion, Andy Purvis, but there were many players with a chance; it was indeed an "open" tournament. I was busy posing for the Press, who, as usual, spent ages trying to get a picture of a wink in mid-air, when I was collared by Andy and we took a six off the other co-winner of last year, Dave Smith, who was partnering Phil Scarrott. Nick and Gavin Keyte took an early lead with seven off Sean Mayes and Rupert Thompson.

The second round saw Rob Cartwright take the lead and Gavin score $4\frac{2}{3}$ to move into second. Then it was off to the Mill for lunch and, since Peter Wright was not present, Dr Sage, Mr Moore and one or two others reluctantly agreed to keep Graham and his several pints company while the rest returned to the mats.

In the next few rounds, Jim Carrington got fives and sixes and led the field with Rob, Nick and Gavin lurking behind. I had an amusing game where Ian Gameson and myself brought in all our winks to perfect potting positions and got so excited as to let Patrick Barrie pot out. Geoff Thorpe arrived in mid-afternoon and was immediately let off missing five rounds since he had made such an effort to get there at all. He and I got $5\frac{1}{2}$ and so I went second behind Jim but ahead of Nick, who both got sixes. By the end of Saturday's play, Nick had stolen into a narrow lead over Jim and Gavin.

As CUTwC President I was very much looking forward to the Annual Dinner and we had a menu that consisted of foods with the most amusing names we could find, but no sharp edges. It was a great night but, as a result, I missed the pre-lunch rounds on Sunday. Winkers were found in the Mill where I was coerced by the Winking World Editor into writing this report. I learned that Gavin was now in front, ahead of Jim and myself with Nick some way back in fourth. Poor Gavin scored four points in the rest of the tournament, while Andy began to quietly creep up the table to be in with a chance.

Jim and Andy got separate sixes in round 12 while I scored five. There was a move to rapidly start round thirteen before Nick, who had missed the previous two rounds, could arrive back. Fortunately he got back just in time for the draw for the penultimate round, which matched Nick and Martin Dennett with Jim and Chris Wilson, and Andy and Ben Soares with Phil Scarrott and myself. Exciting stuff, eh? My game started with Andy and I bringing into the same area and I came out on top, not without a little luck. The rest of the game involved us digging in and hoping Ben wouldn't pot many. It soon became evident that he was going to pot lots, so we fished out some of mine and I found myself in five having to pot and then squop for 5-2.

Cambridge Open scores

Round 1

Inglis & Keyte 7 – Thompson & Mayes 0
 Hancock & Wilson 3 – Rose 4
 Satchell & Grant 5 – Gandy & Barrie 2
 Smith & Scarrott 1 – Purvis & Collins 6
 Sage & Smale 1 – Carrington & Gameson 6
 Marchant & Lewis 1 – Cartwright & Reid 6
 Andrew 6 – Jones & Moore 1

Round 2

Inglis & Collins 3 – Scarrott & Purvis 4
 Hancock & Carrington $5\frac{1}{2}$ – Andrew & Barrie $1\frac{1}{2}$
 Satchell & Jones $2\frac{1}{3}$ – Keyte $4\frac{2}{3}$
 Smith & Moore 4 – Gameson 3
 Wilson & Lewis 3 – Gandy & Reid 4
 Sage 1 – Cartwright & Grant 6
 Rose & Mayes 6 – Smale & Thompson 1

Round 3

Inglis & Scarrott 6 – Barrie & Thompson 1
 Satchell & Keyte 2 – Carrington 5
 Smith & Cartwright 4 – Andrew & Purvis 3
 Wilson & Grant 4 – Gameson & Reid 3
 Smale & Collins 6 – Cullingham 1

Round 4

Inglis & Gameson 3 – Collins & Andrew 4
 Satchell & Barrie 1 – Wilson & Smith 6
 Scarrott & Reid 1 – Carrington & Purvis 6
 Marchant & Keyte 6 – Smale & Grant 1
 Cartwright & Cullingham 5 – Thompson 2

Round 5

Inglis & Carrington 6 – Scarrott & Smale 1
 Satchell & Lewis 5 – Purvis & Cullingham 2
 Smith & Andrew 2 – Marchant & Grant 5
 Wilson & Barrie 5 – Collins & Gameson 2
 Cartwright & Keyte 5 – Reid & Thompson 2

Round 6

Inglis & Grant 6 – Wilson & Andrew 1
 Satchell & Reid 0 – Gameson & Scarrott 7
 Smith & Lewis $1\frac{1}{2}$ – Collins & Thorpe $5\frac{1}{2}$
 Barrie & Carrington 6 – Cartwright & Purvis 1
 Smale 4 – Cullingham & Keyte 3

Round 7

Inglis & Smith 6 – Dennett & Andrew 1
 Satchell & Scarrott 1 – Purvis & Barrie 6
 Wilson & Mayes 0 – Rose & Cartwright 7
 Gandy & Gameson 7 – Thorpe & Smale 0
 Grant 6 – Carrington & Cullingham 1
 Collins & Keyte 6 – Lewis & Reid 6

Round 8

Inglis & Reid $2\frac{1}{2}$ – Smale & Keyte $4\frac{1}{2}$
 Smith $2\frac{1}{2}$ – Grant & Andrew $4\frac{1}{2}$
 Dennett & Carrington 3 – Collins & Mayes 4
 Wilson & Gandy 3 – Cartwright 4
 Scarrott & Rose 1 – Thorpe & Moore 6
 Barrie & Cullingham 3 – Gameson & Purvis 4

Round 9

Inglis & Marchant 2 – Gandy & Rose 5
 Hancock & Cartwright 2 – Purvis & Moore 5
 Satchell & Mayes 5 – Cullingham & Thorpe 2
 Dennett & Gameson 1 – Carrington & Keyte 6
 Wilson & Smale 3 – Grant & Scarrott 4

Round 10

Inglis & Cartwright 2 – Gameson & Keyte 5
 Hancock & Mayes 1 – Reid & Barrie 6
 Satchell & Rose 4 – Carrington & Andrew 3
 Smith & Soares 3 – Thorpe & Scarrott 4
 Wilson & Sage $5\frac{1}{2}$ – Moore & Smale $1\frac{1}{2}$
 Gandy & Purvis 6 – Grant & Cullingham 1

Round 11

Dennett & Cartwright 2 – Marchant & Gandy 5
 Wilson & Reid 3 – Thompson & Carrington 4
 Scarrott & Keyte 1 – Smale & Purvis 6
 Barrie & Collins 4 – Rose & Gameson 3

Round 12

Dennett & Keyte 1 – Rose & Smale 6
 Wilson 2 – Collins & Cartwright 5
 Gandy & Cullingham 4 – Barrie & Wynn 3
 Scarrott & Carrington 6 – Gameson & Marchant 1
 Grant & Reid 1 – Purvis & Thompson 6

Round 13

Inglis & Dennett 6 – Carrington & Wilson 1
 Hancock & Barrie 5 – Reid 2
 Smith & Keyte 2 – Andrew & Gameson 5
 Gandy & Thompson 1 – Rose & Grant 6
 Scarrott & Collins 5 – Soares & Purvis 2
 Marchant & Cartwright 6 – Smale & Cullingham 1

Round 14

Inglis & Andrew 3 – Marchant & Dennett 4
 Hancock & Reid 2 – Cartwright & Barrie 5
 Smith & Cullingham 7 – Scarrott & Thompson 0
 Sage & Rose 0 – Gameson & Grant 7
 Carrington & Collins 6 – Soares 1

At this point Nick strolls over and tells me, "We've stuffed Carrington". Oh my God... I remember watching Dave Lockwood in the last game of the Singles when he needed a simple pot in five to win the tournament and wondering why he didn't just pot the wink instead of looking at two-foot squops. All was now revealed to me as I realised that the tournament could well be mine if I potted this one. Eventually I steeled myself, stuck it in, and got the squop.

So the final round saw me top by less than 0.1 points per game from Jim and Nick who were joint second. I joked to Jim that we hadn't partnered each other yet... then immediately apologised as the computer printout showed our names together. Jim replied that, since I had played fewer games than he, my average might fall below his if we lost heavily. In the end we took a six off Ben leaving Nick needing seven to retain his share of the trophy, but Jon Marchant and Martin Dennett took four off him and Chris Andrew. I wandered over to a group in the corner of the room and sat down. Someone asked me how my tournament had gone. "Oh, I've won", I replied, much to general surprise. "You'd better hope it snows again next year."

*There was a young winker called Rob
 Whose limerick couldn't be published.*

From this year's Oxford Freshers' Fair

"A friend of mine knows a maths lecturer at Cambridge who does this... long red beard... likes jumping in the river..."

Andy Debowski sends Tony Brennan his love.

The Diplomacy Society spent most of its time trying to convince people that OUTS is a front organisation for the Moonies.

Cambridge Open results table

A different format but just as confusing as ever... Pars and Opps are the average points per game that your partners and opponents achieved, excluding their games involving you. Diff is the difference. Adj is some cunningly calculated statistic to give some idea what people would have averaged if they'd always been partnering and playing against 'average' players. One final thought: when Richard and Geoff are the average of a group of people, one wonders what lies at the extremes.

Pos	Player	p.p.g.	Total	Pl	W	L	Pars.	Opps.	Diff.	Adj.
1	Stu Collins	4.708	56 $\frac{1}{2}$	12	10	2	3.649	3.496	0.157	4.630
2	Jim Carrington	4.607	64 $\frac{1}{2}$	14	10	4	3.502	3.380	0.243	4.486
3	Andy Purvis	4.385	57	13	9	4	3.380	3.722	-0.564	4.666
4	Nick Inglis	4.375	52 $\frac{1}{2}$	12	6	6	3.682	3.401	0.380	4.185
5	Alasdair Grant	4.346	56 $\frac{1}{2}$	13	10	3	3.430	3.546	-0.161	4.427
6	Rob Cartwright	4.286	60	14	10	4	3.708	3.235	0.738	3.917
7	Matthew Rose	4.200	42	10	7	3	3.406	3.465	-0.024	4.212
8	Gavin Keyte	4.090	53 $\frac{1}{6}$	13	8	5	3.658	3.129	0.899	3.640
9	Ian Gameson	4.071	57	14	7	7	3.888	3.690	0.008	4.067
10	Patrick Barrie	3.731	48 $\frac{1}{2}$	13	7	6	3.446	3.518	-0.091	3.776
11	Dave Smith	3.545	39	11	5	6	3.211	3.566	-0.420	3.756
12	Chris Andrew	3.091	34	11	4	7	3.866	3.762	-0.158	3.170
13	Chris Wilson	3.038	39 $\frac{1}{2}$	13	4	9	3.186	3.733	-0.780	3.428
14	Phil Scarrott	3.000	42	14	7	7	3.689	3.390	0.409	2.795
15	Robin Smale	2.769	36	13	5	8	3.418	3.566	-0.213	2.876
16	James Cullingham	2.727	30	11	3	8	3.846	3.217	0.912	2.271
17	Nick Reid	2.577	33 $\frac{1}{2}$	13	3	10	3.360	3.459	-0.057	2.606

Simon Gandy	4.111	37	9	6	3	3.338	3.730	-0.622	4.422
Jon Marchant	3.750	30	8	5	3	3.830	3.554	0.223	3.639
Richard Moore	3.500	17 $\frac{1}{2}$	5	3	2	3.183	3.288	0.108	3.446
Geoff Thorpe	3.500	17 $\frac{1}{2}$	5	3	2	3.279	3.164	0.450	3.275
Graham Hancock	3.083	18 $\frac{1}{2}$	6	2	4	3.465	3.413	0.140	3.013
Ed Wynn	3.000	3	1	0	1	3.792	3.362	0.567	2.717
Alex Satchell	2.815	25 $\frac{1}{3}$	9	4	5	3.016	3.849	-1.183	3.406
Sean Mayes	2.667	16	6	3	3	3.336	3.386	0.065	2.634
Martin Dennett	2.571	18	7	2	5	4.132	3.818	-0.005	2.574
Paul Lewis	2.300	11 $\frac{1}{2}$	5	1	4	3.145	3.609	-0.573	2.587
Ben Soares	2.000	6	3	0	3	3.561	3.746	-0.431	2.215
Rupert Thompson	1.889	17	9	2	7	3.378	3.414	0.049	1.864
Stew Sage	1.875	7 $\frac{1}{2}$	4	1	3	3.178	3.868	-1.057	2.404
Adrian Jones	1.667	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	2	0	2	3.500	3.421	0.158	1.587

The National Pairs

Armitage Room, Queens' College, 27th & 28th April 1991

by Jon Mapley

Could it really be the 20th Pairs? Eh lad, it takes yer back, dun't it – gettin' oop at 3 in't morning to make yer 'ovis butties afore goin' to't pit.

Would there be 18 or 19 pairs, that was the question, as Alex had decided this was the dividing line between an all-play-all and some weird centre-party proportional representation. Fortunately for those of us to the right of Genghis Khan (no relation, Larry), 17 arrived at the starting line including, for the first time, the reigning World Champions.

As a possible precursor to all national championships, the computer rankings which nobody cares about (do they Charles?) were used for the seeding, by aggregating the points of the two combatants; the 5000+ of Geoff and Andy gave them a comfortable pole position. (By the way, I hear Nigel Mansell is doing a cover version of the old Kenny Rogers classic, "You chose a fine time to leave me, loose wheel".)

As usual, the draw required the Liverpools and Arsenals to play on Yeovil's slope in the early rounds and, as usual, a few slithered on the frozen surfaces in early January. Nick and Alex were beaten 4-3 in the first round by the sixteenth seeds, Rupert Thompson and Jon Marchant, and then in round 3 the better-known Jon (Mapley) and Richard were humiliated 6-1 by Gavin and Simon, whose rating is surely on the way up after the Hampshire Open (that's my excuse anyway).

The fourth round contained five pot-outs in its eight games, one of which saw James and Nick (Reid) inflict a first defeat on Stu and Ian, leaving just four 100% teams at this stage. Alan and Charles were playing together for the first time in this tournament and, having had an early bye, were sitting nicely on 19 points from three games. Yet another Oxford pairing, Phil Carmody and Chris Wilson, put an end to their run in the fifth with a $4\frac{1}{2} - 2\frac{1}{2}$. Now a gap had opened. Geoff and Andy were on 31 $\frac{1}{2}$ and the untried partnership of Dave Lockwood and Patrick were just behind on 30 but third place was already seven adrift of the two undefeated pairings. Another unbeaten record which had fallen in the fifth was that of Jim Carrington and Alan Boyce, one again to an unfancied pair, Ed Wynn and Rupert Wilson (more of them later). Jim and Alan lost again to Gavin and Simon, while Rupert T. and Jim inflicted a 7-0 on Mike and Phil Clark, whose play was becoming sufficiently random to see them eventually finish last after Mike abandoned Phil with two games left.

There were few surprises in the next four rounds, although my potting was costing Richard and me points and games. Dave Smith and Alasdair took 6 off us as did Simon Gandy and Julian a few rounds later, but we were staying in the top five and, although some shuffling took place, no new pairs infiltrated this handful between the end of round 6 and the close of the tournament. It's probably true to say that, by the end of round 11, the winner

The 1991 National Pairs

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	Tot	Pos
A	Geoff Myers & Andy Purvis	—	6	6	5	1	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	6	6	5	6	7*	6	5 $\frac{1}{2}$	6	6	6	87	1
B	Dave Lockwood & Patrick Barrie	1	—	2	6*	6	6	7*	3	5 $\frac{1}{2}$	6	6	6	6	6	5	6	83 $\frac{1}{2}$	2
C	Jon Mapley & Richard Moore	1	5	—	3	6	7*	7*	1	6	6*	6	1	5	1	7*	7*	74	3=
D	Alan Dean & Charles Relle	2	1*	4	—	2*	6	5	5 $\frac{1}{2}$	6*	5	5	6	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	7*	6	6	74	3=
E	Nick Inglis & Alex Satchell	6	1	1	5*	—	5 $\frac{1}{2}$	6*	5 $\frac{1}{2}$	3	6	4	7*	4	4	3	6	72 $\frac{1}{2}$	5
F	Jim Carrington & Alan Boyce	4 $\frac{1}{2}$	1	0*	1	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	—	3	1	2	5	1	6	3	2*	6	6*	47 $\frac{2}{3}$	11
G	Mike Surridge & Phil Clark	1	0*	0*	2	1*	4	—	2	4	4	2*	5 $\frac{1}{2}$	1	3	2	0*	36 $\frac{1}{2}$	17
H	Simon Gandy & Julian Wiseman	1	4	6	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	6	5	—	1*	3	6*	2	1	2	6	3	52	8
I	Stu Collins & Ian Gameson	2	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	1	1	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	5	3	6*	—	4	5 $\frac{1}{2}$	6	2	2	4	1*	51 $\frac{1}{2}$	9
J	Phil Scarrott & Tim Jeffreys	1	1	1*	2	4	2	3	4	3	—	2	1	6	6*	3	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	47 $\frac{1}{2}$	12
K	Graham Hancock & Stew Sage	0*	1*	1	2	1	6	5*	1*	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	5	—	6	5	5	6	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	53	7
L	Dave Smith & Alasdair Grant	0*	1	6	2	3	1	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	5	1	6	1	—	4	5*	3	4	48 $\frac{1}{2}$	10
M	Ed Wynn & Rupert Wilson	1	1	2	1	0*	4	6	6	5	1	2	3	—	7*	4	5	53 $\frac{1}{2}$	6
N	Phil Carmody & Chris Wilson	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	1	2	4 $\frac{1}{2}$	3	2 $\frac{1}{3}$	4	5	5	0*	1	2*	0*	5	4	6*	46 $\frac{1}{3}$	14
O	Gavin Keyte & Simon Julier	1	1	6	0*	3	5*	5	1	1	1*	2	4	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	—	3	1*	37 $\frac{1}{2}$	16
P	Rupert Thompson & John Marchant	1	2	0*	1	4	1	7*	4	3	4	1	3	3	4	—	6*	47	13
Q	James Cullingham & Nick Reid	1	1	0*	1	1	1*	2	4	6*	5 $\frac{1}{2}$	2	2	2	6*	1*	—	40	15

could only come from the top three (Myers & Purvis, 10/10, $60\frac{1}{2}$; Lockwood & Barrie, 9/1, 57; Dean & Relle, 9/1, 54.)

I've already mentioned the Surridge and Clark dive down the table, but two other streaks are just as noteworthy. Phil Scarrott and Tim Jeffreys won their first five games, lost five in a row, won four in a row to be sixth, then lost their last six to end up twelfth. After nine games, Ed Wynn and Rupert Wilson (13th seeds) were bottom of the table with one win, a total of 15 points, and $6\frac{1}{3}$ adrift. They then proceeded to win their remaining seven games, claiming $38\frac{1}{2}$ points and, whilst others had flirted with sixth place, their remarkable charge grabbed it at the death. They were still 19 points behind the top five, but $\frac{1}{2}$ ahead of Graham and Stew, who had played, well, just like Graham and Stew, losing in the mornings and winning in the afternoons.

Geoff and Andy lost at last in the twelfth round, 1-6 to Nick and Alex, and this allowed Dave and Patrick to sneak into the lead by $1\frac{1}{2}$ points. We should have beaten Alan and Charles but another potting fiasco gave them a 4-3. We more than redeemed ourselves by winning 5-2 over Dave and Patrick and, with the other leaders all winning, only 6 points covered the top four at the end of the thirteenth, with the contenders all facing three head-to-head games out of their remaining four.

I'd love to know how many times Alan has potted out against Dave – this time it all went horribly wrong, and he and Charles got one point from the attempt. Richard and I played better to get 6 off Nick and Alex to put them back in our sights, and the champions lost a second game, 2 $1\frac{1}{2}$ - 4 $1\frac{1}{2}$ to Jim and Alan. This gave Dave and Patrick back a one point lead, which was squeezed to $1\frac{1}{2}$ in round fifteen, then extended to 1 $1\frac{1}{2}$ as they got a solid six from Nick and Alex, with Geoff and Andy “only” getting 5 from Alan and Charles.

It was all down to the head-to-head final game, which was late starting due to my enthusiasm to play on the wrong table, and a very tense game saw some nerves from Patrick, and a near-faultless display from the World Champions to retain their title with a well-deserved 6-1. Nick and Alex potted out, but only 5-2, against Alan and Charles, and Richard and I finished with two sevens to tie third, which was more than we'd expected.

The computer thus got the top five pretty well accurately, and the standard shown by many of the new players was encouraging for the future. Now Geoff and Andy will attempt the previously unachieved hat-trick in '92. Good luck – you'll need it!

The NATWA Singles

Silver Spring, Maryland (Kahn residence), 4th & 5th May 1991.

by Larry Kahn

This year there were several surprises even before the start of the first round. Sunshine (*) made his first singles appearance since 1979 and Marg decided to try playing with the biggies for the first time ever. Jim was late as

usual only this time he was so late he hasn't played his first game yet. This left us on a field of eight, with the usual other six of Larry, Dave, Rick, Brad, Bob and Mac. Dave flew in for the weekend from London and apparently only made it because his flight was late. He only spent something like 30 hours in D.C., almost half that at the tournament. We decided on a full round plus top four playoff, slightly shorter than normal, since Dave had to leave early on Sunday to fly back.

The first round went as expected with Larry, Bob and * taking 6's off Mac, Brad and Marg. The random draw set up the Dave-Larry game in the next round and Larry, after bringing in one colour perfectly, potted out. Excellent Dave potting saved two points. Meanwhile, Bob got another 6 to take the early lead. The next two rounds went as expected, Larry getting an undeserved 7 off * on the way. In the fifth round, Brad played extremely well and took 6 off Larry. Dave kept rolling with another 6 (off Mac) and took the lead. Larry recovered in the next round with 6 off Bob and now it began to look like the usual race, with Dave and Larry battling it out, although the trio of *, Bob and Brad were closer behind than in recent years. In round seven there were two surprises, one medium-sized and one the mother of all upsets. Mac beat Rick 4-3 and then Marg took Larry 6-1 in a regular squop game, making all her critical shots. At this point it looked like the tournament had been handed to Dave, who was playing really well with another win, 5-2 over *. This game saw * use a questionable strategy (also as a partial protest against Dave's slow play), never officially ruled out in NATwA. He decided that his best chance was to take the full 30 seconds on each shot, even bring-ins. The practice was immediately outlawed that evening and we now conform to the ETwA ruling on deliberate stalling.

So, with one round to go (rounds got screwed up because of the Jim problem), there were five potential finalists with only Dave certain: Dave had 31 in 7, Larry had 26 in 7, * had 28 in 8, Bob 26 in 7 and Brad 25 in 7. Larry, feeling he really had to push it, tried for and got a 7 off Rick. Brad took 6 off Mac to get in, leaving Bob needing 2 off Dave to tie *. He just got it, at which point * decided not to try and go on, allowing Bob to go through uncontested. This left Dave on 36, Larry on 33, Brad on 31 and Bob on 28. Close.

The finals were held on Sunday, with anyone being able to win it. The first round pairings were Larry-Brad and Dave-Bob. Larry reversed the first encounter result with a 6-1 win and now had to wait for the other game. By rounds, Dave had boondocked all Bob's yellows to the edge in an attempt for the 7. This unorthodox strategy worked and he upped his total lead to four. Next Bob played Larry really tough and looked like he was actually going to win the game after Larry had one of those disaster-type shots. Larry recovered soon after with a miracle shot and now had a chance to win. Bob potted well with his one leading colour but Larry barely caught him with some good potting to escape with a 4. Dave was still playing Brad, and would lead by whatever he scored. Through the third round it looked like 6, but in the fourth a 5-inch pot attempt bounce backwards and destroyed one of Dave's doubles. Brad was able to exploit this incredibly bad luck by playing perfectly

in the last round to set up a possible win. Dave missed relatively easy pots with both colours in the fifth having potted extremely well throughout the tournament to leave himself with a disgusted 3.

This only served as a preliminary for what came next. Brad held off Bob, getting the required 2 for third place. Meanwhile Larry needed 5 to tie. The game started out rather positionally, with both players setting up pot threats. Larry accidentally squopped a big blue from the line with a yellow, but this was in an area with blues only. Green had six free but with a little on a red very near the cup, and a big on both of these. Red was also in good position. Here we go...

Dave brings in his last blue, knocking the little yellow off and leaving six blues free. Green goes for the potout, pots five but in potting the big off the squop does not move the little enough and the pot is now nearly impossible. Larry decides to click off safe, about 10 inches from the cup and at least a foot from any Dave winks. Reds are all free, relatively near the cup, several surrounding a yellow. Yellows are also all free, but one little is touching the cup and one big is about 16 inches away. Red decides to pot, but misses the hardest one long. Yellow resquops the big blue to prevent that potout and Dave now has to squop the green from a foot with the other big. He does it! Red can now take a yellow, go out and protect, or continue to pot. He tries a pot and misses short on another red, making it non-trivial to pot. Yellow can either try for the squop with a big from about 10 inches or (gulp) go for the pot. Larry decides the pot is the best bet, given the way red missed, and makes the three easy close ones but misses the totally nurdled one. Dave now tries a one and a half inch squop of the little yellow on the big blue but misses short (is this 1984 all over again?), leaving himself on the blue and knocking the yellow so that it is angled down on the pot side of the squop, which is about three inches from the cup. Red continues potting, making one and then missing, figuring he'll have at least two more goes at it. WRONG!! Larry makes the pot off the squop, then the easy one, and lines up the sixteen inch pot of the big. After a brief moment of indecision on which squidger to use, he knocks it straight in, much to Dave's disbelief of the last three rounds. It really did appear to both players that Dave had the tournament won after the blue squop of green. Both players are obviously drained but there are still some very important shots to play. After a round of misses, Larry makes the last green for the 7 and another miracle finish at Dave's expense. I only wish we had the final few games on tape; this is the kind of stuff we need to make winks a real spectator sport.

Overall scores: Larry 50, Dave 46, Brad 38, Bob 36 (first four had played ten games; the rest played seven), * 28, Marg 15, Mac 14, Rick 11. Some irrelevant notes: Bob and * should have had a playoff game. Bob's NATwA total after the tournament was 699. Dave went over 700. Brad needed to make a short squop in the last game to prevent any fractional scores for the whole tournament. Marg in her first singles finished sixth, averaging slightly over 2. A warning for the 1991 ETwA Singles: Larry has won both singles in 1985, 1987, 1989, etc.?

The Catford Invitation

Chez Relle, 18th May

by Gavin Keyte

As ever, Charles invited a varied group of winkers to take part in his annual tournament. Andy and I, having misjudged the time required for the trip from Oxford, arrived so early that we were unable to set proceedings off to a good start because the local off-licence hadn't even opened. When some of the other combatants had arrived, we played a few practice games while waiting for Rob, who ensured the traditional late start.

Almost as soon as play began, Patrick missed his sixth wink and was squopped. James battled admirably to hold off Alan and Duncan — so admirably in fact that, in round five and with his last wink now free, Patrick could opt not to pot out on the grounds that they were 6-1 up already and James was less than confident about his potting. After four rounds Charles provided an excellent lunch of vegetable soup, pigeon in wine, rounded off with double portions of cheesecake¹. Some of us even sampled the wine.

After lunch, things became slightly hazy — cheesecake can have that effect — but since Alan emerged victorious he must have sampled slightly less than the rest of us. Final scores: Alan Dean 37, Patrick Barrie 35, Andy Purvis 34¹/₂, Charles Relle 32, Rob Cartwright 27, Gavin Keyte 26, Phil Clark 25¹/₂, James Cullingham 24, Duncan Budd 11.

I'm sure that I speak for all of us when I say that it was a most enjoyable day and that I hope there'll be many more. Thankyou Charles.

What have Stew Sage and Alan Dean got in common?

by Andy Purvis

Charles sent me a 'gluttonous analysis' of the results, done by him on the day after the tournament. As Charles points out, since he went almost straight from the tournament to a party, this was something of an achievement in itself. Unlike last year, the right hand ('dominant') corners did rather well, averaging a little better than a 4-3 win. They did particularly well after lunch, something that could not be said for some of the players: the quotes are from Charles... It was Phil's birthday, and his average dropped from 4 before lunch to a post-prandial 2-and-a-bit: "age seems to be wearing down his resistance". Good news, though, for James — "Alcohol may debilitate him slightly, but further research needs to be done on the subject". Alcohol "does not produce a great swing" for me, apparently, though those who saw me in the Marlborough Arms this summer may venture to disagree. Patrick and Alan, whose averages went up by two as a result of lunch, and Rob, whose p.p.g.'s tripled, would do well to take lunch with their partners at

¹ Not to mention the attempts to set fire to the house with some flying biscuit wrappers.

tournaments, while Charles might get more to drink if he eats with his opponents: "The battle with age continues. But note I scored 6 and 5 in the two games immediately after lunch. Why should I be afraid of Sage?"¹ Lunch led to a 60% upsurge in Duncan's fortunes but was not so kind on Gavin: "The most dramatic crash of the year — an average of $5\frac{1}{3}$ before lunch and 2 after. Keep him off the bottle." As Charles concludes, gluttony seems to be good for you, unless you are too old, too young, or it's your birthday.

Letters to the Editor

16th May 1991

Dear Sir,

After reading Mr Mapley's attempts at being a verbal smart-ass, I would like to profer the following: "You can pot the underneath wink, can't you, but you can't wink underneath the pot, can you?"

On the same theme, true palindromes should use the letters not the words. The simplest I could think of was "to pot" (wow!). I'll give a pint to anybody who can make one using the word "squidger".²

Yours sincerely,
Rob Cartwright

P.S.

*There is an old winker named Mappily
Who sends "Odes to the Ed" most happily
While to write with some zest
He tries of his best
'Tis a shame they all turn out so crappily...*

Dear Sir,

I write on the issue of slow play. For the second successive year the National Pairs has been a 17 round all-play-all. At 45 minutes per game this works out to 12 hours and 45 minutes of winks. I'm sure the tournament lasted longer than that.

1. The tournament got off to a slow start. Starting the Pairs is more difficult than a Swiss but it always helps if everybody is there on time. The Pairs is a particular problem as more than 18 pairs means splitting the field into two leagues, so please bear with the Tournament Organiser — he's doing his best.

¹ A quote from the O.U.T.S. dinner: "After lunch Stewart seems quite formidable, especially if one is seeing double".

² And I'll give a squidger to anybody who can make one using the word "pint".

2. Some games took longer than 45 minutes. Every game that is late finishing delays three in the next round: the two involving the pairs in the game and the game waiting for the mat. If these games finish late because of their late start, it is probable that the whole next round will be delayed. The situation is even worse in a Swiss, where one late-finishing game automatically delays the whole round.

3. Some people inexplicably went missing when the game was due to start. Jim and I started two games against single opponents. Others disappeared during games to open their beer taps. This does not create too much delay in Cambridge but does in Southampton, where two flights of stairs have to be negotiated.

4. Some people have difficulty getting back from the pub. Sometimes pubs are slow to produce a lot of meals so help them by splitting up and going to different pubs. There is no excuse for returning late because you have been drinking. You will simply have to drink quicker. If you can't get back from the pub on time, I'm afraid that those lunchtime visits to the Hat and Feathers, the King's Arms and, dare I say it, even the Catford Ram will have to be sacrificed.

Yours sincerely,
Alan Boyce

Dear Sir,

I am writing to you on behalf of a perhaps innumerable band of winking men and women whose views have been suppressed for long enough; but now it is time that our opinion should be heard.

I refer, of course, to the highly irrational rule that squidgers should be circular. We feel that fish-shaped squidgers should be equally valid. Surely it is high time the current antiquated position should be changed, and I recommend this course of action for the next meeting of the rules sub-committee.

Yours sincerely,
an irate nobleperson

Winner of the 'Sick Letter of the Month' competition:

Dear Sir,

I notice in the report of World Singles 35 that Larry refers to a 'junior birdman', which is presumably some sort of 'up in the air' shot. I should like to suggest that an A10 could be the term for a shot where you bomb and destroy your partner's pile under the mistaken belief that it was your opponent's.

Yours sincerely,
Alan Boyce

A Practice to Stop Slow Play?

by Andy Purvis

If I am taking an age over my shot, my opponents are in the awkward position of having to wait for an indefinite period before they can play. It's not as though they know there'll be time for a cup of coffee or a sit down and a nap. There may be, there may not. This is very frustrating for them and they may lose concentration, which helps me. And, if I take an age over *every* shot, it could benefit me in another way: if I'm slow on all my shots, then I'm obviously used to that tempo. It won't affect my play, but my opponents, used to playing shots much more frequently, could well lose their form. The pressure on each shot is increased too, so they may play too defensively. All in all, playing slowly could be giving me a considerable advantage.

This must be unfair, yet is hard to legislate against. Limiting the amount of time spent on a shot might speed the game up but might also make it farcical, with no-one having time to consider the position fully. The two-minute rule doesn't work. Chess clocks sound like the ideal solution, but are expensive and would undoubtedly lead to some very twisted sets of rounds, with one side having run out of time. The proposal I outline below is aimed to reduce the amount of slow play by helping the opponents of slow players. Unlike previous attempts, it does not directly handicap the slow player, who is still able to play at his or her own pace, and hopefully does not violently distort the nature of the game. It is also simple to apply.

The suggestion is that when a player has taken more than thirty seconds over a shot, the opponents are allowed to practise until the shot is played, provided that a mat is available nearby. This would apply both before and (perhaps with a longer time threshold, maybe a minute) in rounds. The objection might be raised that licence to practise is too much of a bonus to the offended pair. Good – we surely want to encourage quicker play. While I'm not wishing to suggest that there are any players who play slowly in order to gain the benefits outlined above (heaven forbid!), it still seems distinctly possible that the sight of opponents practising potting with rounds looming might make some players speed up a bit. At the very least the new measure would, if adopted, raise the quality of play in slow games, with both fast and slow players able to play at their best. At best, we might have faster games and more of them in a day. A point worth noting here is that newcomers to the game often give the long waits between shots and games as the worst aspects of tournaments.

The proposal could be applied easily in tournaments where time not space is the limiting factor: it would be simple enough to have a couple of free mats lying around for the Singles final or the Pairs. It might be more of a problem in other tournaments, but only early on in any given round. As games finish, so mats become free for practice. It is, after all, more important to speed up the slowest players than those who are only occasionally a little bit slow.

Finally, in case anyone thinks I have an axe to grind, I ought to point out that I'm easily one of the slower players around.

Auntie Gertie's Problem Corner

Auntie Gertie, who made her first appearance back in WW1, has been too long absent from these pages. Now that the West Midlands Seriously Criminal Squad has been laid to rest, however, she is once more free to roam the streets...

Dear Auntie Gertie,

I don't pot the way Jon Mapley advocates in *Winking World 55*, and I don't squop the way Larry Kahn does in *Winking World 56*. Is there any hope for me, or should I give up the game and emigrate to the States?

Yours hypothetically,
A. Chemist

Dear hypothetical chemist,

It seems to have escaped your notice, but Jon only rarely pots as well as he did in Winking World 55 and few people have ever squopped quite as well as Larry in Winking World 56. Speaking personally, my own solution to being unable to play shots the way better players do has always been to write an pseudonymous 'agony aunt' column. This gives me an opportunity to make snide remarks, which I find very cathartic. It stops me becoming bitter and twisted, guv'nor.

P.S. An industrial chemist assures me that ultraviolet light will cause at least some of Larry's squidgers to disintegrate. Ultraviolet lights are available at very affordable prices from many electrical suppliers. I mention this purely for information.

Dear Auntie Gertie,

I'm worried that I may have cheated in a recent game of three against two. I was one of the two and my partner, not being house trained, had just gone off the mat. This turn of events perhaps confused one of my opponents, who then played the correct colour despite it not being his go. Rather than call a foul shot, I accepted the turn out of sequence, arguing that thereby my partner had already missed. Was I right to do this? Or must I chastise myself with birch twigs as penance for my sins? I've got the birch twigs ready just in case.

Yours hopefully,
A. Masochist

Dear masochist,

This all seems rather contrived to me. Why don't I just come round and do the chastising, like we did last Thursday?

The London Open

Riverdale Hall, Lewisham Centre, 6th July 1991

by Patrick Barrie

The nomadic London Open moved again, this time to the shopping centre of Lewisham. It was good to see some of the illustrious names of yesteryear present: Cyril Edwards, Geoff Cornell, Tony Brennan. Duncan Budd also looked in. Even Anthony Heading deigned to turn up. The tournament was declared open in the absence of the deputy mayor by that distinguished dignitary, Charles Relle, and battle began.

The first round was notable for Simon Dean, whose record in previous tournaments had been a grand total of 4 points from 17 games, scoring a 5-2 victory over Chris Andrew & Stu Collins. Admittedly he was partnering one of the game's most legendary players; so legendary in fact that his fame now spreads to pub trivia machines throughout the land ("In which sport has Alan Dean been 6 times national champion?"). Round 1 also saw the highly fancied but largely untried pairing of Jon Mapley & Mike Surridge defeat the holders, Patrick Barrie & Ian Gameson, 4-3 in a close game full of seasonal fluctuations. This was despite Ian having lost two winks down the X-ray synchrotron at Daresbury while practising at 4.30 in the morning the day before, and was to have a crucial effect on the price of eggs throughout the tournament.

After 3 rounds, Jon & Mike were lurking ominously following a 6-1 win against Tim Jeffreys & Phil Scarrott, just behind Alan Boyce & Rob Cartwright who were also unbeaten at this stage. However, Alan & Rob now hit a bad patch; I don't know whether this was due to the ETwA Chairman's traditional art of ballsing-up (*Winking World* 56), or to Rob's mysterious adverse reaction to playing winks after drinking (as documented in *Winking World* 55).

In round 4 Patrick & Ian didn't wake up early enough in their game against Andy Purvis & a much-improved Elizabeth Whalley and so went down a nice safe 1-6. The ever-harmonious pairing of Graham Hancock & Nick Inglis achieved a 6-1 off Jim Carrington & Matthew Rose to stay vaguely in contention. The highlight of the following round was undoubtedly Geoff Cornell's 5-2 win with Charles against Chris & Stu, possibly Geoff's first win in an Open tournament since Simon Dean was born. Elsewhere Jon & Mike notched up another 6 (off Andy & Elizabeth), while Gavin Keyte & Geoff Myers moved up to 2nd place with a 6-1 over Alan & Rob.

It was only now that someone discovered the trophies (generously donated by Shepherd Neame). I use the word "trophies" strictly without prejudice as there were general murmurings of "not on my mantelpiece". The winners were to receive a splendid cup/vase-like object in a foul shade of meretricious blue, while the runners-up would receive the same thing in a rather fetching charcoal black colour. Possibly as a result of this inspection, Anthony Heading & Richard Moore immediately left the tournament to take no further part in the proceedings, 1st and 2nd place pairs (Jon & Mike and Gavin & Geoff) contrived a 4-3 scoreline between them, while the 3rd place

London Open scores

Round 1

Boyce & Cartwright 6 – Edwards & Brennan 1
 Surridge & Mapley 4 – Gameson & Barrie 3
 Purvis & Whalley 5 – Relle & Cornell 2
 Myers & Keyte 5* – Moore & Heading 2*
 Dean & Dean 5 – Andrew & Collins 2
 Inglis & Hancock 2 – Jeffreys & Scarrott 5
 Rose & Carrington 6 – Carmody & Wilson 1
 Cullingham 3 – Smale & Julier 4

Round 2

Boyce & Cartwright 6 – Rose & Carrington 1
 Surridge & Mapley 6 – Smale & Julier 1
 Gameson & Barrie 6 – Cullingham 1
 Purvis & Whalley 6 – Dean & Dean 1
 Myers & Keyte 3 – Jeffreys & Scarrott 4
 Inglis & Hancock 6 – Andrew & Collins 1
 Moore & Heading 5 – Relle & Cornell 2
 Carmody & Wilson 2* – Edwards & Brennan 5*

Round 3

Boyce & Cartwright $4\frac{1}{2}$ – Purvis & Whalley $2\frac{1}{2}$
 Surridge & Mapley 6 – Jeffreys & Scarrott 1
 Gameson & Barrie 5* – Inglis & Hancock 2*
 Myers & Keyte 4 – Rose & Carrington 3
 Dean & Dean 5* – Moore & Heading 2*
 Cullingham 6 – Relle & Cornell 1
 Smale & Julier $4\frac{1}{2}$ – Edwards & Brennan $2\frac{1}{2}$
 Carmody & Wilson $4\frac{2}{3}$ – Andrew & Collins $2\frac{1}{3}$

Round 4

Boyce & Cartwright 1 – Surridge & Mapley 6
 Gameson & Barrie 1 – Purvis & Whalley 6
 Myers & Keyte 7* – Dean & Dean 0*
 Inglis & Hancock 6 – Rose & Carrington 1
 Jeffreys & Scarrott 6 – Cullingham 1
 Smale & Julier 1 – Moore & Heading 6
 Relle & Cornell 3 – Carmody & Wilson 4
 Andrew & Collins 3 – Edwards & Brennan 4

Round 5

Boyce & Cartwright 1 – Myers & Keyte 6
 Surridge & Mapley 6 – Purvis & Whalley 1
 Gameson & Barrie 7* – Jeffreys & Scarrott 0*
 Dean & Dean 1* – Carmody & Wilson 6*
 Inglis & Hancock 2 – Moore & Heading 5
 Rose & Carrington 7* – Smale & Julier 0*
 Cullingham 0* – Edwards & Brennan 7*
 Relle & Cornell 5 – Andrew & Collins 2

Round 6

Boyce & Cartwright 2* – Inglis & Hancock 5*
 Surridge & Mapley 3 – Myers & Keyte 4
 Gameson & Barrie 2* – Edwards & Brennan 5*
 Purvis & Whalley 2 – Rose & Carrington 5
 Dean & Dean 5* – Cullingham 2*
 Jeffreys & Scarrott 2* – Carmody & Wilson 5*
 Smale & Julier 1 – Relle & Cornell 6

Round 7

Boyce & Cartwright 4 – Jeffreys & Scarrott 3
 Surridge & Mapley 6 – Edwards & Brennan 1
 Gameson & Barrie 6 – Myers & Keyte 1
 Purvis & Whalley 1 – Inglis & Hancock 6
 Dean & Dean 5* – Smale & Julier 2*
 Rose & Carrington 6 – Relle & Cornell 1
 Cullingham 1 – Andrew & Collins 6

Round 8

Boyce & Cartwright 1* – Gameson & Barrie 6*
 Surridge & Mapley 6 – Rose & Carrington 1
 Purvis & Whalley 7* – Cullingham 0*
 Myers & Keyte 4 – Carmody & Wilson 3
 Dean & Dean 1 – Relle & Cornell 6
 Jeffreys & Scarrott 6 – Edwards & Brennan 1
 Smale & Julier 2 – Andrew & Collins 5

pair (Patrick & Ian) were treated to a virtuoso long-distance potting display by Cyril Edwards, partnering Tony Brennan, to go down 2-5.

Normal service was resumed in round 7, however, with a 6-1 for Jon & Mike over Cyril & Tony while, at the head of the chasing pack, Patrick & Ian caught up with Gavin & Geoff when the latter pair's winks obligingly dived under the former's at every conceivable opportunity. Graham & Nick moved up to 4th with a 6-1, while lower down the order the dynamic Dean duo had their fifth consecutive pot-out game, this time a 5-2 win against Simon Julier & Robin Smale.

In the last round Jon & Mike clinched the tournament with yet another 6-1. Gavin & Geoff were held to a 4-3 win by Phil Carmody & Rupert Wilson, allowing Patrick & Ian to pip them for 2nd place. The only player I haven't specifically mentioned so far in this report is James Cullingham, playing solo, but he won't thank me for doing so now as in this round he failed to score a point.

Congratulations then to Jon & Mike for winning with such an impressive set of scores. It really is good to see some older names on the trophies for once (!).

Pair	Played	Total	Average
Mike Surridge & Jon Mapley	8	43	5.375
Ian Gameson & Patrick Barrie	8	36	4.500
Geoff Myers & Gavin Keyte	8	34	4.250
Nick Inglis & Graham Hancock	7	29	4.143
Richard Moore & Anthony Heading	5	20	4.000
Andy Purvis & Elizabeth Whalley	8	30 $\frac{1}{2}$	3.812
Matthew Rose & Jim Carrington	8	30	3.750
Phil Carmody & Rupert Wilson	7	25 $\frac{2}{3}$	3.667
Tim Jeffreys & Phil Scarrott	8	27	3.375
Cyril Edwards & Tony Brennan	8	26 $\frac{1}{2}$	3.312
Charles Relle & Geoff Cornell	8	26	3.250
Alan Boyce & Rob Cartwright	8	25 $\frac{1}{2}$	3.187
Chris Andrew & Stu Collins	7	21 $\frac{1}{3}$	3.048
Alan Dean & Simon Dean	8	23	2.875
Robin Smale & Simon Julier	8	15 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.937
James Cullingham	8	14	1.750

Pot-Squop

by Andy Purvis

"The aim of the game is to flick winks into the pot." – The Rules of Tiddlywinks, 1958, and quite right too.

When tiddlywinks started, potting out was the only way to win. It seemed obvious that your best chance was to start potting as soon as you could. Many early games were therefore straightforward potting races involving all four colours. Some bright spark – the hero of our tale – figured that covering an opponent's wink might give his own partner a bit more time. Squops would be taken to slow down an opponent or rescue a squopped partner. The most efficient approach was to only go for squops with one colour, while the other spent all its time potting. Thus began the noble tradition now known as "pot-squop".

Then someone, probably someone who ate children and shot guide dogs¹, invented "double-squop" – not trying to pot anything until you are in control – and everything went downhill. There was no longer any reason to pot early, but the game still had to go on until someone potted out. Games became very tedious and, at times, complete immobility set in: a Silver Wink semi-final between Oxford and Bristol in 1960/61 was abandoned after 5 hours 20 minutes of play with three games still left to go. The first response was to introduce a time limit "just in case" no pot-out had occurred. Unsquopped winks were counted to see who had won, and potted winks counted double. This, incidentally, is where the outdated term "time-limit points" comes from (rounds are a new-fangled measure, only introduced years later to counter time-wasting). At first, this reduced still further the importance of potting but the value of potted winks was upped from two to three and, although many parts of the game have changed almost beyond recognition, the basic balance between potting and squopping has stayed broadly the same: potting much before rounds is almost always risky, and pot-out opportunities do not often present themselves.

The risk involved in trying to pot out is higher than many people think. To have an evens chance of potting six in a row, you have to be making 89% of your pots. It does seem a bit unfair that, while you can play a reasonable squopping game with at least two winks potted, having a single wink squopped is enough to make potting a very bad idea. So pot-squop may seem like an unworkable tactic – a relic of the naïve days when sixty-odd pairs would play in the Northern Junior.

However, pot-squop still has several things going for it, especially for newer players. Potting six isn't easy, but it's the easiest way to beat a top player. Because of this, many top players are a bit unnerved if you can develop a pot threat. They may dive in to your area to stop you trying to pot out – even if this forces you into a squopping game, it often gives you an excellent position. In addition, making the game revolve around a pot-out

¹ And who was certainly at Oxford...

threat is one of the best ways to simplify the strategy: pot-squop is the “boot-the-ball-upfield” approach to tiddlywinks – it may not be pretty but, as in football, it’s good for surprises. Pot-squop games can also be very exciting, especially if your opponent is of like mind. Fair warning: pot-squop is also a good way of collecting a few 0-7’s. In the remainder of this article, my aim is to mention many of the tricks that help to make pot-squop a viable strategy, at least for special occasions. I’d like to distinguish right away between “passive pot-squop” (trying a pot-out if the opportunity arises) and “active pot-squop” (basing the game plan around a pot-out attempt). There is a continuum between the two. Something to bear in mind is that the more active the strategy, the worse your position will be if you don’t get to try the pot-out.

Active pot-squop starts on the bring-in. Your early aim is to bring in six of at least one colour before your opponents do. I’ll assume that, to begin with, you have an open mind about just which colour is trying to pot (although the squidge-off winner has a turn’s advantage here). Things that can make that decision for you are carnovskies, gift squops, and getting squopped. You may find that the latter two gang up to force you into a squopping game – for now at least. You can gain time on the bring-in by aiming your squopping colour at opponent winks, especially if the opponents have landed on themselves. It is easy to overdo this; you may find you have gained so much time you are down to one colour. If an opponent sends one off the mat, think: do you *really* want to approach and squop? Other good places for your squopping colour are among your potting colour, to defend it from being squopped, and behind enemy lines on the opposite side of the pot, a likely place for a missed pot to land. That said, keep count of your opponents’ winks: a wink or two with an eye on your opponents might help stop *them* potting out. Your potting colour obviously wants to be close to the pot and not too close to any opponents.

If it looks like you are going to get a chance of potting out, your squopping colour may want to take out the most threatening opponent winks. There are several things to consider. If it is your squopping colour to play, only one opponent – the one playing next – is a danger to your partner. Winks of the other opponent pose a less immediate threat. Be very wary of colour order tricks: if yellow is your potting colour, a blue on a red is particularly bad news, as blue can send red at an undefended yellow – you should try to squop such a pile, or at least knock the winks apart. Think also about which of your potting winks would be hardest to rescue: these are the ones most in need of defence. If there’s nothing obvious to do, make your least pottable flat winks easier, especially if you can move them to useful defensive positions in the process. You might also like to consider lining up boondocks or double boondocks, especially of the colour that plays straight after your potting colour. If the pot-out is very close boondocking these is a good way to up the stakes; for instance, sending a yellow to the corner neatly increases the pressure on yellow’s attempt at squopping the sixth blue!

Enemy winks landing next to your potting colour really ask the question. You could, of course, squop it: think about how good your position would be in a squopping game, considering how good your opponents are and

how long they have in which to turn things around. Discarding the notion of squopping, if you've finished bringing in, potting six seems like a good idea. If not, potting five and bringing in is good provided you've a safe spot to bring in at; such a spot is ideally near your partner and only gives one opponent a line (preferably the one playing straight after – if it squops you, your partner can try a colour-order knock-off). I wouldn't recommend potting four and bringing in the fifth, although I've been known to try it. A less drastic, and sometimes overlooked, solution to a sixth wink at the baseline is to pot just the threatened one and bring in.

When you have managed to arrange six pottable winks, you should think about the order of your pot-out. Missing the first is rarely disastrous. Missing the fourth is likley to be curtains. The pessimal number to have in the pot is three; you can play a squopping game with two potted, and can hope for first place (or at least a point!) with four or five in. Long pots or nurdled winks are obvious contenders for the first one to try, especially if they don't have a safe landing zone. Threatened winks that would be hard to rescue are also high on the list. If your hand tends to shake when you're nervous, you might like to leave a big wink until last (I find they're less likely to slip out before I'm ready). It is hard to know quite when to play any pots off other winks you might have happened to squop – serves you right. A special consideration here is: where will the bottom wink end up? If it might land on one you're trying to pot, you had better get that one out of the way first.

In many, probably most, games, you won't get the chance for an early pot-out. But events during the game may resurrect the whiff of an opportunity. Count the free winks after cruds. Look for colour-order knock-offs: you might be surprised how often one of these can free the only squopped wink of a colour. If you're breaking a pile, think about the effects of potting something out of it: pot-outs starting in this way are ones to cherish. You should always, in any kind of game, keep in mind which of your colours is going for first place. The difference between pot-squop and double-squop is merely one of degree here. In rounds, pot-squop often resembles playing for a 4-3 win; you try to make sure of winning the game before thinking about the options for your squopping colour. Because of the risk of missing points in this way, I'd not recommend pot-squop as a rule of thumb for rounds unless there is a realistic chance of getting the pot-out. Matchplay is an exception: if you win all the games, you win the match.

What should you do if you get caught with a few in? The situation is often hopeless, but some things are worth a try. If you've got two or three in, you might try potting some opponent winks to equalise numbers. A spate of boondocking might give you a local numerical advantage; this may last just long enough for you to rescue your potting colour, but makes things easier for your opponents if not. If the pile is unguarded, attack it with your closest winks. Otherwise, try to use winks from further away; these can suck in the guards and let the closer winks finish the job. Try not to run out of winks of one colour: your rarer colour is more valuable, so be careful on approach shots and only commit it when you think it can do something useful – a classic rôle for the last wink of a colour is going for long range knock-off-and-go-

past shots. Getting on a pile with both colours is almost always useful. Don't be clever if you get on piles: blast them. Don't forget how useful the Good shot can be for freeing winks. (The range of the Good shot is often underestimated – a couple of millimetres can be possible provided you don't mind going off the table.) If time is running out, think about squopping opponents to hang on for a win or two points: you might want to move your winks to between the pile and the pot. If your opponents are starting to make potting out noises, try to attack the pile in such a way as to involve their preferred pot-out colour. If things are looking really bleak, you would probably prefer your opponents to pot out with the colour preceding your pot colour, since this gives you more chance of a point. You might be able to at least make things awkward to this extent. Something I hopefully needn't point out: if you've missed with a few in and been squopped, you owe it to your opponents to keep playing at your normal speed: slowing down in order to stop them converting the position into a big win is simply cheating and thoroughly deserves to be punished as such.

There are some ploys that are more psychological than strategic, and I might as well mention a few of them here. Think: is it to your advantage to try to spring the pot-out attempt as a surprise, or would you rather let your opponents worry? The sneaky way is tricky but neat; try to make it look like your approach shots have other ambitions such as knock-offs, groan if you are 'unlucky' enough to carnovsky, that sort of thing... If you want to worry your opponents, perhaps with a view to forcing them to dive into your area, discussions with your partner about "bringing the sixth one in" or "one bounce or two?" are quite effective, as is 'surreptitiously' taking your potting squidger out of mothballs. Playing your approach shots as pot attempts is also good for a giggle, as is boondocking anything your potting colour has found itself on top of.

Pot-squop certainly doesn't always work, and there are game situations when it simply isn't the right thing to do. But good pot-squop games are wonderful to play in, to watch, and to work for. It's quite something to be aware that your next shot may make the difference between 0-7 and 7-0. The games can be really topsy-turvy, and even the direst situations can be rescued with good play, luck and steady nerves. For instance, if you've five in, one squopped, but the other colour is all free, why not try the "death or glory" option of double-pot? Which takes us back to where we started...

Personal Column

Lonely individual, deserted by tall, dark handsome man, seeks new partner for a weekend of fun on the mat. The game I've got in mind is for pairs and I like to be on top. So if you're good seduction or skilled at manipulating Bristols call (0527) 68646 and ask for April Date. But remember: I want a man who can keep it up all weekend.

Cambridge

by Rob Cartwright¹

Cambridge. A university town built in a featureless, flat landscape — so featureless and flat you wonder why anyone chose it as a location for anything. “The magnificence of St. John’s, the noteworthy splendour of Trinity, the sheer pauntliness of the Backs”... and gazing at the magnificent noteworthy sheer splendour of King’s College, it would be a world-weary traveller indeed who did not pause to think, “Why the *@£∞# didn’t they build the whole town two inches to the right?”

A fair question, to which an answer may only be found by turning back the clocks of time... Let us imagine it is the year 1282. An urgent message arrives at the court of King Edward I. “Most noble sire, I have built a bridge over the river Cam”. The Royal Reply, despatched with all regal velocity, reads, “Whatever for?”

Thus the enterprising but foolhardy pontifect was left with a bridge on his hands, since it was readily apparent to everyone that this newly-constructed thoroughfare, leading as it did from nowhere in particular to nowhere else at all, was rather a cock-up. Occasional passers-by would point and mock, saying, “Who’s the bloody fool that built a bridge here? Ha Ha Ha!” “I don’t know, must be wrong in the head”, he would reply, puce with shame. Then, in a daze, he made his second mistake. Instead of building some decent restaurants, a few pubs and a laundromat to attract human beings to his bridge, he hit on the rather dull idea of erecting some very high walls behind which a semi-aristocratic élite could hide from the outside world and go to each other’s rooms for sherry and Tiddlywinks...

How To Avoid Arrest Whilst Trying To Win The Singles Just Once More

by Jon Mapley

“What’s that awful screeching noise?”

“It’s my rape alarm, don’t come any closer.”

“Excuse me sir, but I’m the Boots’ store detective. Would you mind explaining your actions please?”

“Certainly, I was just crouching down, looking through this young lady’s glass cabinet, when I heard this dreadful noise.”

“So you admit you were looking up her skirt?”

“No, I was merely trying to get my eyes at the right level to ascertain whether the essential curvature is still present in the product.”

“You were ogling her thighs.”

“No, I was scrutinising that tub of Chanel talcum powder in the display cabinet.”

¹ A plateful of jelly to the first person to point out who first wrote this article. This offer is not open to Rob Cartwright or dead members of Monty Python.

"And why would you be doing that, sir?"

"Because if the lid is the shape it always used to be, I will probably buy it."

"O.K., tell me what significance there could possibly be in the shape of a talcum powder lid?"

"Can I phone my solicitor before I answer that question?"

Nostalgia isn't what it used to be...

by Rob Cartwright

As a brief postscript to Richard Moore's musings in the last WW, here are a few memories of my ten years in the 'sport'. Oh God, is it really that long? Aaarrgghh...

— Seven of us (Alan, Mike, CB, Graham Josland, Phil, me and another novice) squeezing into Alan's Morris Marina from Waterloo to Catford. This left an indelible, and yet-to-be refuted, impression of winkers' organisation — it was Phil's and my introduction to winks tournaments.

— Charles and Cyril coming virtually to blows over a dispute and both refusing point blank to play on. He'd probably deny it, but I could have sworn I heard someone say, "I'm leaving and I'm taking my winks with me!"

— The infamous 45-pint round in Churchill Bar, where I was totally outclassed in all aspects of the proceedings; closely followed by Graham Hancock's immortal words, "Only slightly".

— Being potted out on by Trish Willink (a CUTwC novice) in the Singles, then to be asked by her, "What happens now?"

— Jim Carrington totally cracking up when I drew the Sainsbury's turkey in the Dobbles.

— Graham Josland chuckling "I've just potted out" in the 1984 Silver Wink; it meant we'd won at last.

— After inventing the phrase "Never look a gift horse in the buttocks" to describe the squop of trivial distance, I proceeded to miss *every* gift horse of the day. They were obviously Trojan horses.

— Watching the first of four pottable yellows sail gently over the pot in round 5 in the 1983 Silver Wink. We lost the match by a point. (The really irritating thing, of course, was that Doc Josland and Phil Clark, theoretically the strongest pair, didn't win a game. Shame on you!)

— Photographing CB's megacruds in the Union Bar. For those who didn't know, the Sotwink sweatshirt is a copy from a photo and, yes, those broken winks are real.

The Wessex Trophy

Wadham College Refectory, Oxford, 24th & 25th August

by Andy Purvis

Charles had deemed that the weekend was to be his official 50th birthday. The need to drive home has been known to inhibit his lunchtime libations, but this time he arrived in Oxford on the Friday evening by train. Mike and Cyril were also around... The weekend had started as it was destined to go on.

On the Saturday, the tournament eventually limped into life despite there being no-one so drunk as to accept the post of tournament organiser. Nick was to go for the hat trick and someone else (I think it was Alan Boyce) was persuaded to be the opposing captain. There was, as usual, some new weird joker system designed to stop anyone knowing what was going on or who was really winning but, in spite of this, most people worked out that Nick's team was building up a considerable lead. Then lunch set in. The convenient proximity of the King's Arms meant that very little time was lost in getting to the pub, and general enthusiasm ensured that not much time was lost once we got there. The discovery that the pub sold half gallon carry-kegs meant that more people than time got wasted throughout the afternoon.

After a few more rounds it eventually became dark enough to play cricket, so we trooped off to the 'nearby' Merton sports ground. Croquet had been advertised too, but Merton had thoughtfully provided a large marquee on their croquet lawn and filled it with some conference or other. Charles brought his pétanque set along with him, so he and Jon sensibly played that while the rest of us ran around like idiots – the perfect way to unwind after a solid afternoon's drinking. The 'stumps' were 4 foot lengths of garden cane and the pitch was a ploughed field cunningly disguised as a flat piece of grass. The standard of play may be estimated from the fact that Chris, who had never played cricket (but, crucially, is teetotal), took several wickets in one over. Nick's team won narrowly when the scores were seasonally adjusted. Jon headed off to a motel room that he had booked, uncertain how much floorspace was available, and Tim and Phil went to sample some Kidlington pubs.

The rest of us were too late to get much room in the King's Arms, so sampled the dubious delights of Carfax chippy or (not quite so bad) Burger King. Matthew thoughtfully bought a bottle of port which, together with a bottle of Madeira kindly provided by Charles, seemed necessary – we didn't reach the pub until nine o'clock, and some people were voicing serious concern that we might not be able to drink enough by closing time.

No worries. The Marlborough Arms is a wonderful place. Mary was there at the piano, playing her usual selection of songs (we generally knew one line from the chorus of each). She packed up and left, but the singing went on... and on... By twenty past three, everyone had drunk enough to be going on with. Some had drunk more than that, I'm told. The Madeira and port remained unneeded, even unwanted.

Amazingly, only Gavin failed to make the prompt restart on Sunday. I was there all day, but can only remember two things about it. Nick's team won, and Charles managed another half-gallon of scrumpy in the Turf while I sipped uncertainly at a glass of water.

The following Wednesday, I went to the exhibition of Fauve paintings at Charles' invitation. When we met up, he handed me a couple of tapes of Flanders and Swann. I was tempted to ask why, but thought better of it and instead tried (unconvincingly) to bluff it out. Soon after, vague half-memories drifted into mind of Patrick leading a chorus of the Hippopotamus song ...

Nowink's Impottible: A Review

by Charles Relle

I should like to add a few ideas to Jon Mapley's article in WW55. In all my remarks I am assuming, unless I state otherwise, that winks are within easy potting distance. In describing the edges of winks, "front" and "back" are always with respect to the pot.

1. Potting from the bottom of a pile

Typically the pile is of two winks. There are three basic cases: (i) the lower wink is behind the upper wink; (ii) the lower wink is totalled or very nearly so; (iii) the lower wink is in front of the upper wink.

(i) Mostly this is an easy shot, whether or not the winks are lined up towards the pot. You have to play the shot very slightly harder than for a normal pot. There are, incidentally, some positions and distances where the upper wink is directly in front of the lower from which both winks will pot at a stroke. I shall leave you to discover these for yourself. Problems start at or near the point at which, if you play a potting shot, you cannot hear the squidger click on the lower wink. You then have to play much harder, aiming to send the upper wink three or four times as far as the lower wink if they are of the same size. It is a difficult shot, most playable when the winks are large on small, and least when they are small on large. Another difficult shot is when the upper wink is on the front edge of the lower. You have to graze the upper wink and then apply pressure from about halfway across the lower wink, ending in a normal potting shot.

(ii) This is mostly very difficult, though large on small is easy, as is the fried-egg. Otherwise, on a normal mat, you have to play it so hard to get the lower wink to lift that you risk losing control altogether. If the two winks are equidistant from the pot but not a total squop, place the squidger halfway across the upper wink at the point where you judge the edge of the lower wink to be, and play to the point where the edges of the two winks meet. I call this the intersection point. If the upper wink is to the right of the lower, aim it to the right edge of the pot, and the lower wink at the middle of the pot. You

need to play this shot more vigorously than an ordinary pot shot, and this increases the further the upper wink is off the lower. You may need to play an air shot.

If you judge that so much of the lower wink is visible that you can play its back edge, do this. The shot is much easier.

(iii) This is easy for two winks of the same size if the lower wink is just visible. Play a normal potting shot, starting with the squidger about a third of the way on to the upper wink. Play slightly harder than you normally would. The more of the lower wink that is visible, the further back you need to start, and the more vertically you should hold your squidger. The extent of the squop is very important here. If you get to the conventional "bristol" position¹, you are at the limit, and if the upper wink is further off the lower you are more likely to pot the upper wink. Somewhere (another one you can discover for yourself) is the magic distance from which both winks will go in. The same technique goes for small on large, but remember that it is the *large* wink that you are trying to pot, and play hard enough to do so.

If the upper wink is not directly behind the lower, the shot depends on whether the very back of the lower wink is covered. If it is, play from the centre of the upper wink to where you judge the back of the lower wink to be, aiming the lower wink directly at the pot. If it is not, play from slightly forward of the middle of the edge to the intersection point, playing slightly harder than for a normal pot shot.

A special case is large on small. If the back edge of the upper wink overhangs that of the lower, you can treat the pile as though it were a totalled squop as in (ii) above. If the lower wink is under the front edge of the upper, or even just visible in front of it, I do not think that it can be potted. I await Mapley's reply to this. If much of the lower wink is visible in front of the upper, see below.

If you have to pot the lower wink when it is so far in front of the upper that the above techniques will not work, you are reduced to a shot that sends your wink one way and the lower wink another. You hold the squidger almost vertical, and stab at the front edge of the lower wink. This has three disadvantages: it has to be an air-shot, you may send your own wink off, and it is hard to get enough control to make the pot. Additionally the upper wink may not be sufficiently far on the lower for you to get enough purchase to accomplish the shot.² Avoid this shot if you can, especially if you have not experimented to find out what will and will not work.

I said that typically the pile is of two winks. What if it is not? Mapley's advice is quite right. Concentrate on the wink you have to pot, almost to the exclusion of anything else. Remember, however, that the wink most likely to

¹ Whose convention, Charles?

² If there's very little overlap but the line of centres points straight at the pot, there's a fancy way of potting the lower wink. Using a thick-edged squidger (ideally made of cork or rubber), whack down hard on the top wink just behind the back edge of the lower wink. If you judge this right, the springiness of the mat can sometimes ping the lower wink in. — Ed.

influence the object wink is the one immediately above it, and think, if you need to, in terms of one of the shots described above.

2. Potting one off one

A. Same size

I shall start with the totalling position. I am a simple soul, and always play an ordinary pot shot for these, with the same pressure or slightly harder than if the wink were flat on the mat. The upper wink pots and the lower is often nurdled. This is quite desirable if it belongs to an opponent.

If the upper wink is directly a little in front of the lower, again I play a normal potting shot, rather harder than for the totalled position. Unlike Mapley, I do cross the back edge of the lower wink *and* play through to the mat: I simply find this easier. The lower wink often nurdles. A bad misjudgement may pot the wrong wink, but then a failure with Mapley's method could leave you the victim of an easy squop. If you really want to be accomplished, learn both methods and use each according to the game situation. I use the method I have described in all shots where the front edge of the upper wink is not resting on the mat. If it is, I hold the squidger nearly vertical and aim to hit the upper wink just in front of the front edge of the lower, and use not very much follow-through. However, this is a normal potting shot, not a stab shot. The lower wink moves, sometimes to a nurdled position. In effect, you are playing through the upper wink to the lower one, as if the latter were nurdled, and this is where the lift for the upper wink comes from. If the upper wink is so far forward on the lower that such a shot cannot be played, you have to get the lift from elsewhere. Play about a third of the way in from the front edge of the upper wink, and take your squidger off it as you cross the front edge of the lower wink. Play hard, the sort of shot you would play for a nurdled wink. If the squop is sufficiently slight that the lower wink is sure to plink out from under the upper, play an air potting shot starting about halfway across the upper wink. This ought to boondock the lower wink: very satisfactory if it is an opponent's.¹

What if the lower wink is in front of the upper? If the upper wink is resting on the mat, the shot is straightforward. Start fairly far up the upper wink. This applies also if the upper wink is not resting on the mat, whether you rest on it or not. It is better to start too far up than too far down, as you have to get some of the lift from pressure through the lower wink. This type of shot will serve until you get to that critical point, mentioned in 1(iii) above, at which both winks will go in. From here to the totalled position, I do not use the "squop the pot" technique Mapley suggests. Instead, I hold the squidger slightly more vertically than normal and, starting about one third from the back edge of the upper wink, play a hard potting shot. The effect is to pot the upper wink, tossing the lower about three times as far as the upper, a long way over the pot. This is quite spectacular, and rather more happy-go-lucky than the Mapley technique. I said that the shot is straightforward if the

¹ If you want the lower wink to stay there, try playing the shot with the very minimum of follow-through — Ed.

upper wink is resting on the mat, but there is a difficulty if it is covering the lower so slightly that it will plink out on contact, forcing you to play an air shot. My advice here is to start about two thirds of the way up the upper wink, so that the plink-out occurs as early as possible in the shot (which must be played quickly and continuously), and you are potting virtually from the mat.

Now, angled shots. If you have a plink-out position, play as just described, well forward on the upper wink, making a small allowance for the lower wink. As in all these shots, practice is essential; if you persevere, you will soon discover how much pressure is needed. If the upper wink is forward of the lower, much depends on how far it is on and on what the angle is. Again, experience and practice are essential: no precepts can replace the thought "I have been here before". However, there is a rule of thumb and forefinger. Play from the centre of the upper wink, or just forward of it, to the intersection point (as in 1(iii) above), and you will generally get the right angle. If this angle seems wrong, aim for the edge of the pot on the same side as the lower wink. Nudge slightly in to the intersection point: this helps to get lift. The more the upper wink is over the lower, the less pressure you need. You do need to give the wink quite a flick.

If the two winks are equidistant from the pot, I start about three fifths of the way from the back of the upper wink and half way across, and play a potting shot nudging towards the intersection point. This is when the edge of the upper wink rests on the mat. These shots are quite hard. If the edge of the upper wink does not rest on the mat, I play a simple potting shot, angled slightly towards the side on which the lower wink is. For all these angles shots I am sure it helps to use a fairly large squidger, at least standard set size.

If the upper wink is behind the lower, always start with the squidger about a quarter of the way back from the front of the upper wink, further forward than for a normal pot. This is for several reasons: you are less likely to have to play an air shot, you have more control, and you get some lift from the lower wink. Angle the shot slightly towards the side on which the lower wink is. If the upper wink is very high on the lower, consider the "squop the pot" method. Make sure to aim the lower wink beyond the pot's edge, even if this entails aiming slightly off-centre with the upper (unless you can afford an accident). If the upper wink is low on the lower, so that you must play an air shot, or such that the lower will plink out, start near the front of the upper wink as before. You want firm control and you want lift from the mat: if you play from the back you get neither.

B. Small off large and large off small

All the methods I have described work for most shots of this type. The angles and pressures, though, are slightly different. Again I urge you to get out a mat and some winks and practise. If you know what you can do, you can surprise people. In the 1980 Singles I was playing Alan Dean. I had five winks flat on the mat and one squopping at an awkward angle. I potted all six. He said, "I thought you would move that and I would squop it". But back to the subject: for small off large, in a direct line, if the front of the upper wink

is on the mat, aim to hit it just pot-side of the front of the lower wink. Now push the upper wink back so that it overhangs, but is supported by, the front of the lower. Play at the front of the lower wink, almost at the edge. You have to hit these shots fairly hard and the second, especially, is very dangerous, as it is quite easy to pot the lower wink instead. The further back on the lower wink the upper wink is, the less hard you have to hit it. If the upper wink overhangs the back of the lower, the "squop-the-pot" method is as good as any. This will also work for angled shots in this position, but my advice on these is the same as Punch's to those about to get married.

For large off small, the advice given for same size shots works most of the time. For angled shots, it is easy to over- or under-estimate the influence of the lower wink. Try them out. When the lower wink is completely covered, it is very important to notice where under the upper wink it is, and to make appropriate allowances. It helps to rest the squidger on the upper wink and therefore on the wink below. When playing the stroke, aim very slightly towards the side where the lower wink is. If the lower wink is under the middle, a normal pot shot will work. So will it if the lower wink is under the back but not visible, though cautious players may prefer the "squop the pot" method.

3. Potting from a three wink pile

This is a very important and much-neglected part of the game. If you are Green and there is a pile of green-red-green, you are much more likely, in rounds, to want to pot off this than off a pile of green-red. Potting off most three wink piles is less difficult than generally supposed, and will nearly always free the bottom wink. An analysis of possible three wink piles would take a long time, so here are some general principles; the top is influenced by the middle and bottom winks just as, in a two wink pile, the upper wink is influenced by the lower; the influence of the middle wink on the top is, other things being equal, greater than that of the bottom; other things are not equal, for winks exert more influence the further they are covered. It is usually better to pot the top than the bottom of a three wink pile, as then the other two winks will go less far. When attempting to pot from a three wink pile, take a good look at it, as Mapley says, decide which one you want to pot, work out what the other winks will do to its flight path, and aim very carefully. Think out even what part of the pot you expect the wink to land in. Be precise: you may be wrong but you will gain knowledge. Remember what you did, and what the result was. "'Hit it and hope' will get you nowhere", says Mapley, and he is right.

4. Potting from the middle or the edge of a pile.

What Mapley says is very sound, and I have only one thought to add. When potting from the edge of a pile, start with your squidger as near to the front of the wink you are playing as you can, and play the whole way across. This has the effect of pushing winks below out of the way, and ensuring that the mat has as much influence as possible on the flight path of your wink.

5. Odds and Ends

Potting two winks as once: I have indicated that there are several positions, other than that described by Mapley, from which this can be achieved. I must practise from his position, for I find it difficult. Potting nurdled winks: this is possible without a flexible squidger, so do not despair if you do not possess one.

A scholar called Paul Maas once wrote a book on Textual Criticism, which was reviewed by another scholar named Pasquali. The review was longer than the original book. It looks as if this review is going the same way, so I will leave you with this thought: the 1990 Singles involved many potouts, and Mapley got a 7-0 against me, so maybe you should follow his advice where it differs from mine. On the other hand, I beat him in 1987, 1988 and 1989. If you are in doubt, remember that these articles are on potting, and look at the scores in the 1989 finals. Only two players had no potouts for or against: Mapley and myself.

Silly Issue-Filling Competition

Which currently-active player was suspended from a society promoting real ale for voting against a pub stop after a Silver Wink match?

What did one do if one spunned?

To what was the turnaround attributed that gave England their most recent victory over the U.S.A. in an international? Was it:

- a) American dependence on a 'strategic way of thinking'?
- b) The British team drinking Worthington 'E' with two rounds to go?
- c) The American team drinking Worthington 'E' with two rounds to go?

Which currently-active player has the highest proportion of pot-out games?

In the ETwA Singles qualifying leagues, Larry has won 57 games and lost only three. Who told me that?

Who has the highest proportion of sevens and zeros, out of players with more than 100 games?

Who invented double-squop in America?

Name the eight players on the Goons' team that played CUTwC in 1958, and as many of the referees as you can.

Who were QESH, VOMIT, OBwink, LUSTS and QUILTS?

Several American players have ended up with odd nicknames. Which are which? Ferd, Moishe, L, Horsemeat, Cannonball, Dragon; Michael Schwartz, Larry Kahn, Peter Wulkan, Richard Hussong, Dave Lockwood, Bill Renke.

In what decade was the first patent for tiddlywinks granted?

Which is the odd one out? Murgatroyd, scrunge, piddle.

Which of these some-time-M.P.'s has potted out? Denis Healey, Clement Freud, David Penhaligon.

Which of these cricketers played against CUTwC? Imran Khan, Malcolm Nash, Dennis Compton.

Who was the first Chairman of ETwA? Rev E A Willis, Peter Downes, Charles Relle.

What shot scores $1\frac{1}{3}$?

Which teams played the first tiddlywinks match after the invention of the 'modern game'?

Match up the pairs to leave a definite mismatch:

ULU	Junior birdman
Nurdled	Carnovsky
Port Stanley	Potting out
Muenster	Sub
Strategy break	TKO's
Penhaligon	Murgatroyd
HYTHNLBTWOC	Altrincham coffin

Who named the John Lennon Memorial Shot?

What was the order of these innovations? Rounds after the time limit; boondocks; the point transfer to the side potting out; two larger and four smaller winks; the Bristol shot; filed squidgers; ETwA; the colour order being fixed in the rules.

What is or was the Steen Factor?

RHEOLAU BROGABOTWM.

1. Chwareuir Brogabotwm gan badwar chwaraewr, gyda'r posteuriaid gyferbyn a'i gilydd. Mae'n y gen yw ysgytio'r botymau i'r llestr.
2. Defnyddir mat gyda arwynneb tabyg i ffelt, heb fod yn flewog, o.o., blanced nou garped sy'n ddigon mawr i roi'r botymau 3 troedfedd o'r llestr. Lle mae'n bosibl chwaraeir y genau ar fatiau ffelt yn mesur 2 lathen gyda llathen. Mae matiau awdurdodedig i'w cael oddiwrth y gwneuthurwyr swyddogol. Dylai'r mat orwedd ar wyneb caled esmwyth a gwastad. Mae gan gapten yr ymwolwyr hawl i wrthod chwarae ar fwrdd yn mesur llai na 2 lathen x llathen. Mae llinellau y man cychwyn, sydd i'w marcio yn rhob cornel o'r mat, i fod yn llinellau syth ac yn sgwar i groeslinellau'r mat pellter o lath o ganol y mat.
3. Mae'r llestr i fod yn $1\frac{1}{2}$ modfedd o uchder a $1\frac{7}{8}$ o drawsfesur. Dodir y llestr ar ganol y mat. Botymau potedig yn unig sydd i fod yn y llestr, ac ni cheir symud botymau potedig o'r llestr.
4. Defnyddir 6 botwm yr un:-
2 mawr, trwch $\frac{3}{32}$ ", trawsfesur $\frac{7}{8}$ ".
4 bach, trwch $\frac{1}{16}$ ", trawsfesur $\frac{3}{8}$ ".
Mae disg plastig, trawsfesur rhwng 1" a 2" i'w ddefnyddio i wasgu'r botymau, ac fe'i gelwir yn "ysgytydd".
5. Y Sgor.

Sgoria'r chwaraewr cyntaf i ysgytio ei holl fotymau i'r llestr 4 pwynt; yn ail 2 bwynt, a'r trydydd 1. Nid yw'r pedwerydd yn cael pwynt o gwbl. Cydgyfrifir sgoriau'r partneriaid. Os ennillir y gen drwy "botio allan" (gweler paragraff 10) trosglwyddir 1 pwynt i'r par gorchfygol o sgor y par a gollodd.

6. Dechreuad.

Yn gyntaf y mae pob chwaraewr yn rhoi 6 botwm o'r un lliw tu ol i'r llinell gychwyn, ac yna saethu un ohonynt tua'r llestr. Rhoddir y botymau yma yn ol tu ol i'r llestr. Rhoddir y botymau yma yn ol ty ol i'r llinell gychwyn. Y chwaraewr agosaf i'r llestr gyda'r cynnig yma sydd yn dechrau. Os oes cydradd cyntaf mae'r chwaraewr yma yn cynnig eto.

7. Mae'r chwarae yn mynd rhagddo i'r un cyfeiriad a bysedd cloc. Chwarae pob un ei fotymau ei hyn; un cais bob tro, gyda chais ychwanegol am bob botwm y llwydda i'w gael i'r llestr y tro hwnnw. Os symudir botwm o'r llestr gan fotwm arall fe'i rhoddir yn ol yn y llestr. Os daw botwm i orffwys yn pwyso ar ochr y llestr fe'i rhoddir i orffwys yn wastad, ac yn cyffwrdd a'r llestr, hyd yn oed os gorchuddir botwm arall drwy wneud hyn.

8.9 Ffiniau.

Y llinell gychwyn ac ochrau'r mat yw ffiniau'r chwarae. Os chwaraeir un botwm neu fwy dros neu ar y ffin/neu'nrrhy agos i'r ffin i'w chwarae, fe'i rhoddir yn ol ar y mat, lled botwm mawr o'r ffin, yn y lle'r aethant oddi ar y mat. Os cynnwys y botymau hyn yn neu fwy o fotymau'r chwaraewr fe gyll y chwaraewr yma ei dro nesaf. Ni ellir rhoddi botymau sydd yn caesi'r ffin yn yr ergyd yn ol yn agosach na 4 troedfedd i'w gilydd.

9. Gorchuddio (neu Arfrogi).

- a) Ni chaniateir chwarae unrhyw fotwm a orchuddir, pa nor rhannol bynnag y bô felly.
- b) Mewn twmpath o ddau fotwm neu fwy chwaraeir yn gyntaf y botwm ar ben y twmpath yn unig gydag ysgyriad parhaol. Caniateir cyffwrdd a'r botymau eraill yn y twmpath yn ystod yr ysgytiad os yw'r botymau hynny'n uniongyrchol o dan y botwm a chwaraeir gyntaf. Os rhyddheir rhai o'r botymau caeth, neu bob un ohonynt, gelwir hyn yn "ddiarfrogi".

c) Pan fydd gweddill botymau un par wedi eu harfogi, fe gyfrifir nifer botymau rhydd (h.y., y rhai heb fod yn gorchuddio botwm arall a heb fod yn gaeth) y par arall. Caiff y par hwn y nifer yma o droeon. Os yw botymau un aelod o'r par yma yn gaeth cymerir y troeon yma gan ei bartner, neu ynteu cymerir y troeon gan y ddau chwaraewr yn eu tro. Rhaid i'r ysgytiad nesaf ryddhau un o fotymau'r par arall. Os na wneir hyn symudir un o'r botymau i ganiatau i'r gwrthwynebwyr chwarae. Os chwaraeir un o fotymau'r gwrthwynebwyr i'r llestr wrth ryddhau, rhaid i'r chwaraewr ryddhau botwm arall, a hynny, os oes angen, drwy symud un o fotymau ei bartner. Os rhyddheir gwrthwynebydd yn ystod y troeon yma, mae'r troeon yma'n dod i ben. Caniateir beth bynnag un troo i wrthwynebydd a ryddheir cyn iddo gael ei arfogi eto.

10. Potio.

Pan fydd chwaraewr wedi potio ei fotymau i gyd ni chaniateir arfogi pellach, ac fe ryddheir y botymau arfogedig a'r botymau a arfogir ymhellach. Rhyddheir drwy symud y botymau sydd yn arfogi fel eu bod yn un pellter o'r llestr. Pan botir y mae pob rhwystr pellach ar parhad y gem yn darfod (gweler isod).

11. Amser.

Awgrymir amser o 20 munud i bob gem. Pan ddaw'r amser yma i ben parha'r chwarae hyd nes y byddo'r chwaraewr a ddechreu yn cael ei dro. Yna chwaraeir pump cylch cyfan. Os bydd y chwarae heb ddarfod ar ol hyn beirnedir y chwarae fel a ganlyn: Caiff pob chwaraewr 3 pwynt am bob botwm yn y llestr ac 1 pwynt am bob botwm heb i arfogi. Yna y mae'r chwaraewr gyda'r mwyaf o bwyntiau yn cael 4 pwynt, y nesaf 2, y trydydd 1 a'r olaf dim pwynt. Y mae partneriaid yn cymryd cyfanswm ei sgor. Os oes cyfartaledd mae'r chwaraewr yn cael "average" sgor.

12. Aflonyddu'r botymau.

Rhoddir yn ol yn eu lle unrhyw fotymau aflonyddir yn ddameiniol, o.e. drwy ddilyn trwedd mewn ysgytiad neu gyffyrddiad corfforol. Os rhwystir botwm yn ddamwiniol yn ystod ei ysgytiad rhoddir y botwm mewn lle a gytunir gan y ddau dim ac mae'r chwaraewr nesaf yn cymeryd ei dro. Os chwaraeir ysgytiad annheg y mae'r tim arall yn gallu gwneud i'r chwaraewr gymeryd yr ysgytiad eto neu caiff adael y botymau bla y maent. Caniateir troi'r botwm drosodd onibai ei fod yn arfogi botwm arall neu ei fod yn arfogedig. Ar wahan i hyn, os yw chwaraewr yn ymyrd ag unrhyw fotwm yn ystod y chwarae neu'n atal gwrthwynebydd, mae'r gem yn darfod, ac mae'r gwrthwynebwyr yn colli 7 pwynt.

13. Trefn y Chwarae.

Cynnwys tim brogabotwm 4 par o chwaraewr. Chwaraea bob par yn erbyn bob par o'r tim arall. Y tim fydd yn ennill fwyaf o bwyntiau (nid yn angenrheidiol y mwyafrif o gemau) fydd y tim buddugol.

Winking World is the official journal of the English Tiddlywinks Association, and used to be edited by Andy Purvis of Merton College, Oxford, OX1 4JD, but isn't any more because he's got better things to do. It is issued free of charge to ETWA members and costs 75p to non-members. Material published in Winking World is not copyright, but anyone who quotes from Winking World is asked to acknowledge the source (it's only fair: we always own up when we crib something).